

Appl. No.09/911,247
Amdt. dated Jan. 12, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 27, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Dear Examiner Duong:

Greetings and a Happy New Year!

Claims rejections based upon 35USC section 102 are cured as follows:

Rejection of claim 1 due to Anwer is overcome by my spelling out in claim 1 that my claim is narrowed to only “fixed bed” gas producers and “fixed bed” water gas sets. Anwer describes and claims a “fluidized bed” type unit.

Concerning claim 2, I should point out that although ashes are already used as fertilizer, I am claiming to make an improved quality fertilizer by means of my invention.

Rejection of claim 2 due to Duplin et al is overcome by my spelling out that the monovalent alkali metal carbonates, silicates, oxides, and hydroxides are to be added to the fuel before combustion, and by the uses that I list for the ashes. Duplin et al describes using various compounds and mixtures as binding agents to be added to the ashes after combustion to somehow form a glaze to bind the ashes together into pellets in a rotary kiln type of device.

Rejection of claim 2 due to Roberts is overcome because Roberts called for the use of certain calcium compounds. Calcium is a bivalent alkaline earth metal, not an alkali metal (all of which are monovalent). I therefore spelled out (at the risk of being redundant) that I am claiming the use of “monovalent alkali metal” compounds, and even gave the well known examples of sodium and potassium.

Rejection of claim 10 due to Roberts is overcome by the fact that Roberts drew his hot gases through some kind of waste heat steam boiler to generate steam separate from the hot gases, not to directly through a steam engine with the hot gases as the actual motive fluid pushing the pistons in the steam engine, in a way similar to the way steam is used. So as to make the matter exceedingly clear, I have spelled out in my claim 10 that my hot gases/vapors are to be drawn/blown directly through the steam engines, etc. as a motive fluid used directly in a way similar to steam.

Appl.No. 09/911,247
Amdt. Dated Jan. 12, 2006
Reply to Office action of July 27, 2005

Rejection of claim 11 due to Habib is overcome by my use of a fixed bed (I have narrowed claim 11 to include only fixed bed units). Habib describes and claims a fluidized bed type unit.

Rejection of claim 11 due to Martin is overcome by my use of a fixed bed (I have narrowed claim 11 to include only fixed bed units). Martin did not even describe a gas producer or water gas set. Martin described some kind of a rotary kiln that did not even generate heat from the actual charge.

Claims rejections based upon 35USC section 112 are cured as follows:

The words "etc.", "such as", and "like" have generally been deleted from claims 1, 2, 10, and 11, and the lists spelled out in greater detail. I also spelled out and expounded upon the process/method used in each claim.

Claim 1 now spells out that the hot bed is of a fixed nature (as opposed to a fluidized bed) in a gas producer or water gas set, and that the compounds/gases to be decomposed are drawn/blown through the said hot bed.

Claim 2 has "various uses such as" deleted from it, and now spells out exactly what uses are intended.

Claim 10 now spells out that the hot gases/vapors are to be used as an actual motive fluid in a way similar to steam and are actually drawn/blown directly through the turbines/air motors/gas motors/steam engines (instead of or in addition to steam).

Claim 11 now spells out that the gas producers and water gas sets are fixed bed, lists off the wastes to be used in greater detail, explains how they are to be processed, and what they are to be made into.

In view of the examiner's earlier restriction requirement, applicant retains the right to present claims 3-9 in divisional /continuation/continuation-in-part application(s).

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Attachments Respectfully submitted by Scotlund Stivers.
Sincerely,



Scotlund Stivers
Page 5 of 5